

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

DONNA CORBELLO,

Plaintiff,

vs.

THOMAS GAETANO DEVITO, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:08-cv-00867-RCJ-PAL

ORDER

(Mot to Compel - Dkt. #397)
 (Cross-Mot for Prot Ord - Dkt. #426)

The court conducted a hearing on April 14, 2011, on the parties' numerous discovery motions. The court heard Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (Dkt. #397), and Cross-Motion for Protective Order (Dkt. #426), and eleven other substantive discovery motions and related requests for relief. Gregory Guillot, George Paul and Robert McKirgan appeared on behalf of the Plaintiffs, and Samuel Lionel, Daniel Mayeda, David Korzenik, Maximiliano Couvillier, III, and Eric Swanis appeared on behalf of the Defendants. This order disposes of the following moving and responsive papers:

- #397** Motion by Defendants Des McAnuff, Robert Gaudio, and Marshall Brickman to Compel Discovery from Plaintiff;
- #425** Response to Motion by Defendants Des McAnuff, Robert Gaudio, and Marshall Brickman to Compel Discovery from Plaintiff (Doc. 397);
- #426** Cross-Motion for Protective Order;
- #427** Plaintiff's Supplemental Response to Marshall Brickman's First Set of Interrogatories;
- #433** Reply by Defendants Des McAnuff, Robert Gaudio, and Marshall Brickman re: Motion to Compel Discovery from Plaintiff; and
- #444** Reply re: Cross Motion for Protective Order.

Defendants' motion to compel initially sought to compel a Response to Request for Production No. 15, or in the alternative, to provide Answers to Interrogatory No.s 13 and 17. After the motion was


1 filed, the Defendants withdrew their request to compel answers to these interrogatories as Plaintiff had
2 Supplemented her responses and answered them. However, the motion to compel still seeks an order
3 compelling other discovery.

4 Having reviewed and considered the moving and responsive papers and the arguments of
5 counsel,

6 **IT IS ORDERED** that:

- 7 1. Defendants' Motion to Compel Discovery from Plaintiff (Dkt. #397) is **DENIED**.
- 8 2. Plaintiff's Cross-Motion for Protective Order (Dkt. #426) is **GRANTED**. The court
9 finds that Plaintiff has met her burden of establishing that Cindy Ceen is her
10 representative whose assistance is used to facilitate the rendition of legal services in this
11 case, and that Plaintiff and Ceen have treated all communications to and from counsel in
12 this matter as confidential and privileged, and that they have not disclosed these
13 confidential communications to any non-parties or third parties. Plaintiff is relieved of
14 the obligation to provide a privilege document log for privileged and confidential
15 communications to and from litigation counsel in this matter, including pre-litigation
16 communications, consistent with the court's prior order.
- 17 3. Any request for relief not specifically addressed in this order is **DENIED**.

18 Dated this 18th day of April, 2011.

19
20 
21 _____
22 Peggy A. Ceen
23 United States Magistrate Judge
24
25
26
27
28